

5 Recommendations

After reviewing current selection practices, the JIG makes eleven recommendations to ease the transition of routine selection from LS to CO. The JIG's charge was to investigate the feasibility of CO staff handling routine selection. The JIG finds no reason to counter this assumption and believes that a significant portion of the material CO receives can be selected by CO staff knowledgeable of the publishing areas without searching the ILS. With appropriate training, RC/AD staff can incorporate selection of routine cases in their daily duties. RC staff can forward works that require searching or greater expertise to an ACQ SO to search and make the selection decision. The ACQ SO would then return the work, in a timely fashion, to the RC staff.

5.1 Make a selection decision for all CO materials prior to exit from CO work stream.

Each work should receive a final selection decision before CO transfers the work to LS. This alleviates the need for the ACQ SO to make a secondary selection decision. Additionally, a final selection decision prior to transfer of the deposit allows CO to retain the unselected deposit in the Deposit Copy Storage Unit (DCSU).

Appendix E includes a table of selection criteria and the corresponding selection decision CO staff should make. This includes the number of copies to be retained and the person responsible for the selection decision – CO staff or a LS SO.

5.2 Install ILS workstations in RC for Selection Officer use.

The JIG recommends that the ACQ SO use at least two ILS workstations in the RC area to search questionable works without holding deposits for a lengthy time. This reduces the physical handling and movement of material outside CO.

5.3 Eliminate manual marking of deposits, e.g. red and blue pencil check marks.

By using a single deposit slip containing the selection decision, cataloging priority, number of copies selected, and the assignment, CO will eliminate the manual marking of approximately 257,167 deposits. When a ACQ SO comes to the RC area to search questionable material, they will slip the deposit with the appropriate selection decision. RC staff will enter these decisions in the online record.

5.4 Reconsider assignment of default selection in CIP Division records.

The JIG recommends that the CIP Division examine its practice of populating the selection field with a default number of copies. When the CIP Division creates an initial record from a submitted galley, it populates the selection field with a default "2 copies." When LC receives a CIP deposit, staff cannot determine whether the material has received a true selection decision in CO or if the selection field represents the default.

5.5 Implement a pilot for 408 commercially published TX and PA music material.

The Selection JIG recommends implementation of a pilot for 408 commercially published TX monographs and PA sheet music material. The pilot will validate initial recommendation assumptions concerning CO participation in routine selection and provide guidance for further implementation. The pilot also allows LS and CO to collect statistical information to further refine selection. This material was selected because:

- 408 TX commercially published deposits represent the largest percentage of material selected by LC.

- A high percentage of CO 408 music material is selected. In addition, RC staff has expert knowledge of music material.

5.6 Maintain statistics on selection.

The JIG recommends that LC and CO collect various selection statistics to measure the accuracy and relative workload among staff making selection decisions. These statistics will be used to assess the success of a pilot and to determine what additional resources are needed for full implementation. General recommended data include:

- Number of selected/non-selected deposits submitted by major publishers.
- Number of selected/non-selected deposits by type of account.

Recommended SO staff data include:

- Percent of material correctly forwarded for decision.
- Percent of material processed within 24 hours.

Recommended RC staff data include:

- Percent of material correctly forwarded for decision.
- Percent of RC initiated selection decisions reversed by ACQ SO.
- Time required for Examiners to make correct selection decisions.

5.7 Reconsider existing CPS.

The Selection JIG recommends that LC assess current CPS to see if they meet the needs of those performing selection and if they accurately represent LC collection goals.

5.8 Maintain current motion picture selection procedures.

Prior to examination, the LS SO currently reviews all motion picture deposits in CO to determine the retention decision. The MBRS JIG recommends that this practice be maintained.

5.9 Select MBRS ancillary materials.

Currently, CO receives many ancillary materials to which MBRS does not have access. To facilitate MBRS access to these materials, the MBRS JIG recommends that CO staff review and apply LS guidelines (Appendix D) to select the following:

- Movie posters
- Press kits
- Style guides, including licensing material
- Scripts and screenplays
- Photographs
- Graphic material/graphic design.

5.10 Perform routine selection on sound recording (SR) deposits by CO.

The MBRS JIG recommends that CO RC staff perform selection on routine SR deposits using the guidelines identified in Appendix D. On questionable deposits, the LS SO will make the selection decision.

5.11 Create a separate searching unit for non-CIP selected monographs.

In the current environment, CO sends all commercial-print monographs to the CIP Division for searching, regardless of whether CIP data is present in the deposit. While the CIP Division and cataloging work streams are not considered within the purview of this JIG, the group makes a general recommendation that only those deposits with CIP data be sent to the CIP Division for searching. Accordingly, the JIG recommends that a new unit be created to search all non-CIP monograph deposits.

All deposits must be searched before they can be forwarded for LS cataloging. This searching allows LS to determine if a

CIP record exists in LC, or if a cataloging record exists in another database such as the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC).

The JIG believes that separating the searching into two different teams may reduce the burdensome workload on the CIP Division and allow deposits to move through the process

more efficiently. This may allow CIP Division staff to focus on validating and verifying the record and on claiming the CIP Division deposits not received from participating publishers. The JIG recommends that another workgroup examine and streamline the workflows within the CIP Division.